DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 064 CS 503 769

AUTHOR Prisbell, Marshall
TITLE Heterosocial Communicative Behavior and Communication Apprehension.
PUB DATE Feb 82
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Denver, CO, February 19-23, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Anxiety; *Behavior Patterns; College Students; *Communication Research; Communication Skills; Females; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Competence; Males; Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Apprehension; *Interpersonal Communication

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the relationship between levels of communication apprehension (high or low) and eight heterosocial (between sexes) communicative behavior variables--conditioned anxiety, heterosocial skills, heterosocial apprehension, activity, proximity, heterosocial expectations, physical attractiveness, and heterosocial importance. In addition, the study evaluated the validity of the Relational Practices Instrument (RPI), which had been developed to measure the eight variables. Subjects were 200 undergraduate college students who completed the RPI and the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension, which was used to classify students as high or low apprehensive. The results showed that low apprehensive students reported greater degrees of heterosocial skills and perceived self-physical attractiveness, and lower degrees of conditioned anxiety and heterosocial apprehension than did high apprehensive students. The findings revealed no significant differences between the two groups on heterosocial expectations, importance, activity, or proximity. The findings provide some support for construct validity of the RPI. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED213064

Marshall Prisbell
Department of Communication
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 687-3993

HETEROSOCIAL COMMUNICATIVE BEHAVIOR AND COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION

The anxiety that may result from various communication situations has been suggested as an excellent area of research in our discipline (i.e., Communication Apprehension). Heterosocial episodes are considered by many college students as an anxiety producing situation (Borkovec, Fleischmann, and Caputo, 1973). Martinson and Zerface (1970) conclude that college students are more concerned and interested in learning to get along with the opposite sex than with help in learning about their abilities, interests, and personalities. Klaus, Hersen, and Bellack (1977), concluded that "finding possible dates" is one of the most difficult tasks for undergraduate college students. Since heterosocial behavior is an important communicative event, it is reasonable that members of the communication discipline be interested -- a discipline concerned with interpersonal competency (Knapp, 1978) and anxiety producing situations. However, the area of heterosocial behavior has received little attention to date in our discipline, unlike other context-specific areas (i.e., public speaking and small group discussion skills).

Since the areas of heterosocial communicative behavior and communication apprehension are concerned with communication competency and anxiety related problems, it seems worth

CS203761

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Marshall Prisbell
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

while to establish their relationships. Thus, the purpose of this investigation is to assess the relationships of heterosocial behavior and levels of communication apprehension. The results of this study would facilitate our thinking in the area of anxiety-related situations and contribute to our discussion in our everyday communication classrooms. In addition, this investigation will evaluate the validity of a heterosocial assessment measure -- the Relational Practices Instrument (RPI).

Communication Apprehension and Dating

There has been a plethora of research on communication apprehension (CA) in the human communicatin discipline since the initial conceptualization developed by McCroskey (1970). CA can be defined as "an individual's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons" (McCroskey, 1977, p. 78).

Previous research linking heterosocial behavior and CA found that high apprehensives had fewer dates than low apprehensives (McCroskey and Sheahan, 1978). In addition, high apprehensives were more likely to date one person to the exclusion of others and less likely to accept a blind date (McCroskey and Sheahan, 1978). Parks, Dindea, Adams, Berlin, and Larson (1980) attempted to replicate the McCroskey and Sheahan (1978) study. Parks et al. (1980) confirmed the

hypothesis that high apprehensive persons were more likely to date exclusively. However, they found that CA was unrelated to the actual number of dates and to the probability of accepting a blind date. Both of these studies should be interpreted carefully since the measures used to assess heterosocial patterns lack face or content validity: dating frequency was used as a general indicator of dating problems which may not be an accurate estimate of overall heterosocial anxiety. This investigation extends previous research on communicaton apprehension and dating by examining a more complete and explanatory model of heterosocial behavior.

Conceptualization of Heterosocial Behavior

Galassi and Galassi (1979), Curran (1977), and Perri (1977) identified four general dimensions of heterosocial behavior as contributing to a lack of heterosocial activity: conditional anxiety, heterosocial skills, cognitive distortions, and physical attractiveness. However, Prisbell (1981) re-conceptualized heterosocial behavior as being comprised of eight dimensions.

The first dimension is labeled conditional anxiety. If individuals have one or more unpleasant, unrewarding dating encounters, they will become classically conditioned to various cues in those situations. Such unpleasant experiences may include a date not showing, or a date complaining

about the evening. Thus, if an individual experiences unpleasant outcomes before or during a date, then the individual avoids future dating encounters. The individual, for the most part, is likely to feel unsafe about future dates.

A second dimension of heterosocial behavior is heterosocial skills. Such skills as initiating a conversation, knowing how to plan a date, conversational appropriateness and timing, and nonverbal communicative behaviors are important to successful dating. Many individuals, however, lack such skills and, therefore, avoid future dating encounters.

Heterosocial apprehension is a third dimension of heterosocial behavior. In this instance, the person has the necessary skills to perform, but becomes tense, nervous, and anxious in the dating situation, causing the individual to behave in a manner representative of those internal states. The individual will also avoid future dating because avoidance becomes a positive reinforcer for the person.

Heterosocial expectations is a fourth variable associated with heterosocial behavior. This cognitive state is defined by performance standards and expectations concerning those standards as they are perceived before dating activity actually begins. For example, one may feel that they should behave, perform, and/or act in a manner consistent with a false perception of a date's expectations concerning the heterosocial encounter. The nature of these faulty perceptions may explain

why certain individuals avoid heterosocial encounters.

A fifth dimension of heterosocial behavior is physical attractiveness. Galassi and Galassi (1979) contend that individuals who are perceived as physically attractive have greater chances for obtaining dates. The extensive research conducted by Berscheid and Walster (1973) supports the notion that physical attractiveness strongly influences the degree to which others will perceive an individual as a desirable dating partner. On the other hand, one's own perceptions of attraction may be just as important in determining dating activities. Thus, responses of others have impact on our behavior and feelings about ourselves and, in addition, our feelings of physical attraction have an impact on approaching others as potential dating partners.

Heterosocial importance is a sixth area of heterosocial behavior. This variable is best conceptualized as one's attitudes toward dating in terms of importance, interest, or desire. In this sense, the individual can make a conscious choice not to date for one of many reasons. For example, an individual may prefer to go out with a group of friends or would rather engage in some other activity which is more important than dating.

A related dimension to heterosocial importance is activity. In this instance, the individual chooses not to date because other activities keep the individual too busy

to date (i.e., part-time or full-time job, school and social organizations).

The last variable comprising heterosocial behavior is proximity. Proximity is defined as the physical closeness or distance between individuals. As a general rule, the probability of two people engaging in interaction increases as the physical distance separating them decreases (Scott and Powers, 1978). Thus, individuals must be in close proximity in order to establish initial communication and interaction. If the individual does not have the opportunity to come in contact with members of the opposite sex then the chance of them engaging in dating decreases. Proximity, therefore, can be seen as playing an important role in dating.

The following sections establish the relationships among the various heterosocial dimensions and communication apprehension.

Heterosocial Skills and Communciation Apprehension

Communciation apprehension has been discussed in terms of an individual's approach-avoidance behaviors. Wells and Lashbrook (1970) found that high apprehensives interacted less than low apprehensives in small group discussions and contributed less relevant interactions than low apprehensive individuals. Scott, Yates, and Wheeless (1975) found that highly apprehensive students in alternative systems of instruc-

tion consulted with tutors significantly less frequently than did low apprehensive students. Furthermore, Hamilton (1972) found that high apprehensives displayed more tension, talked less in small groups, and self-disclosed less than low apprehensive persons. Finally, Heston (1974) and Daly (1974) found that high apprehensives interacted less frequently than did low apprehensive individuals.

Since the individual with high communication apprehension avoids interacting with other individuals and engages in less verbal communication than the low apprehensive person in many communication situations, it seems evident that they would not have as much experience in communicating than the low apprehensive individual. This "experience", for the most part, enables the individual to become a more competent communicator; thus, having appropriate communication skills to carry out dyadic interactions. Therefore, this investigation posited the following hypothesis:

> H1: Heterosocial skills will significantly differ between low and high levels of communication apprehension,

Such that,

> H1a: High apprehensive individuals will report significantly less heterosocial skills than low apprehensive individuals.

Conditional Anxiety and Communication Apprehension

In general, high apprehensive individuals are perceived less positively by others than are low apprehensive persons.

McCroskey, Daly, Richmond, and Cox (1975) found that high apprehensive people were perceived as less interpersonally attractive than were low apprehensive people by members of the opposite sex. Fenton and Hopf (1976) and McCroskey and Richmond (1976) reported that individuals with high CA are perceived as less credible than low CA's. Finally, McCroskey and Richmond (1976) concluded that high apprehensive persons are perceived as being less desirable as an opinion leader.

In sum, it seems reasonable to assume that the high apprehensive person, being negatively evaluated, would find most communication situations unrewarding. It is these unpleasant and unrewarding past experiences which condition the individual to avoid future interactions with others. Thus, the highly apprehensive individual would express higher levels of conditioned anxiety than the person with low CA. Therefore, the following hypothesis is advanced:

H2: Conditioned anxiety will significantly differ between low and high levels of communication apprehension,

Such that,

H2a: High apprehesive individuals will report significantly more conditioned anxiety than low apprehensive individuals.

Heterosocial Apprehension and Communication Apprehension

Heterosocial apprehension states that individuals become tense, nervous, and anxious during a date. Individuals

with high communication apprehension also display anxiety in various situations. Hamilton (1972) reported that high apprehensives displayed more tension than low CA's in a small group setting. McCroskey, Hamilton, and Weiner (1974) also reported that high apprehensive individuals exhibit more tension in a small group setting. Finally, McCroskey, Daly, and Sorensen (1976) found CA to be related to general anxiety.

Since communication apprehension and heterosocial apprehension are both associated with tension and/or anxiety, it seems reasonable that the constructs are related. Therefore, the following hypothesis was examined:

H3: Heterosocial apprehension will significantly differ between low and high levels of communication apprehension,

Such that,

H3a: High apprehensive individuals will report significantly more heterosocial apprehension than low apprehensive individuals.

Heterosocial Expectations and Communication Apprehension

Heterosocial expectation is an explanation of heterosocial behavior which posits that individuals avoid dates because of a low self-concept and/or faulty expectations concerning performance standards. Research linking communication apprehension and an individual's expectations in general has not been fully investigated to date. However,

the relationship between self-concept and CA has been established. Individuals with high oral communication apprehension report low levels of self-esteem (McCroskey, Daly, Richmond, and Falcione, 1977; Snavely and Sullivan, 1976; Snavely, Merker, Becker, and Book, 1976). Since communication apprehension and heterosocial expectations are both associated with self-concept, it seems reasonable that the constructs are related. Therefore, the following hypothesis was examined:

> H4: Heterosocial expectations will signicantly differ between low and high levels of communication apprehension,

Such that,

> H4a: High apprehensive individuals will report significantly more heterosocial expectations than low apprehensive individuals.

Physical Attractiveness and Communication Apprehension

The relationship between CA and physical attraction has not been well researched. However, studies have indicated that people exhibiting high CA are perceived less sexually attractive (McCroskey, Daly, Richmond, and Cox, 1975; Wiss-miller and Merker, 1976). Since self-esteem and perceptions of self-physical attraction have been related (Wylie, 1961), and CA has been associated with self-esteem, it seems logical that individuals with high levels of CA would report low levels of physical attraction -- physical attraction being a component of self-esteem. Therefore, the following hypothesis

was generated:

H5: Physical attractiveness will significantly differ between low and high levels of communication apprehension,

Such that,

H5a: High apprehensive individuals will report significantly less physical attractiveness than low apprehensive individuals.

Heterosocial Importance and Communication Apprehension

Hetersocial importance is an explanation of minimal dating. It is best conceptualized as one's attitudes toward dating in terms of importance, interest, or desire. To date, no research could be found associating communication apprehension to an individual's level of importance in communicating in various contexts or situations. Nonetheless, one could posit that the high communication apprehension person would find most communication situations not important and undesirable. Thus, it makes sense that "people who experience a high level of CA will withdraw from and seek to avoid communication when possible" (McCroskey, 1977, p. 85); the rationale being that the situation is unimportant for the highly apprehensive individual. Therefore, the following hypothesis is advanced:

H6: Heterosocial importance will significantly differ between low and high levels of communication apprehension,

Such that,

H6a: High apprehensive individuals will report significantly less heterosocial importance than low apprehensive individuals.

Activity and Communication Apprehension

Activity recognizes the fact that individuals choose not to date because other activities keep the individual too busy to date. No research, to date, could be found associating communciation apprehension to the amount of activity in which an individual engages. One could speculate, however, that both high and low CA's would engage in similar amounts of activity. Although this investigation is not examining the amount of interaction associated with the activity, it could be said that high CA's would rather engage in activities which involve limited interaction than activities which involve a great deal of interaction. Since this is not the issue at hand, it is posited that high and low CA's will not differ in the amount of activity engaged in. Therefore, the following null hypothesis was explored:

H7: Activity will not significantly differ between low and high levels of communication apprehension.

Proximity and Communication Apprehension

The final relationship to be examined is between CA and proximity. Proximity is a factor potentially affecting one's

dating activities. In order to initiate conversation and obtain a date, one must be in close proximity. Previous research has demonstrated the association between communication apprehension and areas of high/low interaction. For instance, Weiner (1973) concluded that people with high CA avoided seating positions which were areas of high interaction. McCroskey and Sheahan (1976) found that students with high CA sat on the sides and in the back of classrooms. Further, McCroskey and McVetta (1977) concluded that students with high CA tend to avoid sitting in areas which require interaction. Finally, McCroskey and Leppard (1975) found that, "people with high CA preferred remote housing while people with low CA preferred housing near major interaction areas" McCroskey, 1977, p. 87). These findings are evidence that people with high CA will avoid being in close proximity to others, thus, decreasing the chances of interaction. Because of the proximity rule, a person with high CA will not have as many opportunities to interact with members of the opposite sex in order to obtain a date as a person with low CA. Therefore, the following hypothesis is posited:

H8: Proximity will significantly differ between low and high levels of communication apprehension.

Such that,

H8a: High apprehensive individuals will report significantly greater degrees of proximity than low apprehensive individuals.

METHOD

Subject Selections and Procedures

Subject Sample

The sample chosen for this investigation consisted of undergraduate students from a large mid-western university. The total sample size was N=200. A sample size of 200 was chosen, since factor analysis was performed in this study (McCroskey and Young, 1975). However, since this investigation was concerned with low and high communciation apprehensives, the total N size for other statistical tests was 69 (3 low apprehensives and 35 high apprehensives).

Procedures

In all classes, packets were distributed by the researcher at the beginning of a class session. The researcher asked students to voluntarily and anonymously complete the scales at home and return them the following class period. The researcher returned the following day and collected the completed questionnaires.[1]

Criteria for Factor Analysis

All scales were evaluated on the basis of factor analysis, item-scale correlations and internal reliability.[2] For factor analysis, an eigenvalue of 1.0 was used as the guideline for the extraction of factors and the Scree proce-

dure (Cattell, 1952) was employed to determine the number of "valid" factors present within the 1.0 eigenvalue guideline. For oblique factor analysis, a factor was considered meaningful if two or more items loaded on that factor above .40 and accounted for twice the variance of any secondary loading. For the unrotated factor analysis performed in this investigation, a factor was considered meaningful if two or more items loaded on that factor were above .40. Increased internal reliability was the ultimate consideration for determining factor structure in that any items which decreased reliability were deleted from the scale.

Operationalization of Heterosocial Behavior

Heterosocial behavior was measured with the Relational Practices Instrument (RPI) developed by Prisbell (1981). It is a 59-item, seven-interval, Likert-type instrument.[3] The instrument contains eight dimensions: heterosocial apprehension -- five items; heterosocial expectations -- ten items; conditional anxiety -- eight items; heterosocial skills -- eleven items; physical attractiveness -- five items; proximity -- seven items; heterosocial importance -- eight items; activity -- five items.

Oblique factor analysis was performed on all 59 items producing eight dimensions. Seven items on the heterosocial expectations dimension and two items on the heterosocial

skills, however, failed to load on their factors. Therefore, these items were deleted from the study and another oblique factor analysis was performed on the remaining 50 items. This analysis produced an eight dimensional solution, with all items loading on their respective factors, accounting for 61.5 percent of the variance.[4] Split-half reliabilities were: conditioned anxiety = .79; heterosocial importance = .93; proximity = .86; and heterosocial skills = .82. Reliabilities using Nunnally's (1967) internal reliability formula were: activity = .84; physical attractiveness = .90; heterosocial apprehension = .93; and heterosocial expectations = .80 (see Table 1 for scale summary statistics).

Operationalization of Communication Apprehension

Communication apprehension (CA) was operationally defined via the 24-item version of the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension -- the most recent version of the PRCA (McCroskey, 1981). The new 24-item PRCA is a Likert-type self-report instrument. The instrument possesses strong face validity and solid empirical support for predictive validity (McCroskey, 1981).

Factor analysis of the PRCA-24 produced an undimensional solution with all items loading above .51. One item, however, had a factor loading of only .31 on the first factor and, thus, was deleted from the scale. Another factor

analysis was performed and yielded an undimensional solution with all items loading above .50 and with this solution accounting for 48.8 precent of the variance. Split-half reliability (Wood, 1960) of .95 was computed for the 23-item instrument (see Table 1 for scale summary statistics).

Statistical Analysis

Subjects in this investigation were classified as high or low apprehensives based on their scores on the PRCA. The mean PRCA score was 63.77 and the standard deviation above the mean was 19.74. Subjects scoring one standard deviation above the mean were classified as high apprehensives. Subjects scoring one standard deviation below the mean were classified as low apprehensives.

All seven hypotheses in this study were submitted to a one-way Analysis of Variance with two levels of communication apprehension as the independent variable and the relational practices variables as the dependent variables. The alpha level for all significance tests were set at .05.

RESULTS

Hypothesis 1: Analysis of variance was computed for the hypothesis analyzing communication apprehension and heterosocial skills. Results indicated a significant difference between high and low apprehensives on heterosocial skills ($F = 23.34$; $dF = 1/67$; $p < .0001$) accounting for 26 percent of the variance. Specifically, low apprehensives reported greater degrees of heterosocial skills ($\bar{x} = 51.09$) than high apprehensives reported ($\bar{x} = 41.34$). Thus, hypothesis 1 was supported.

Hypothesis 2: Analysis of variance was computed for the hypothesis analyzing communication apprehension and conditioned anxiety. Results indicated a significant difference between high and low apprehensives on conditioned anxiety ($F = 4.43$; $dF = 1/67$; $p < .04$) accounting for six percent of the variance. Specifically, low apprehensives reported lower degrees of conditioned anxiety ($\bar{x} = 33.03$) than high apprehensives reported ($\bar{x} = 37.62$). Thus, hypothesis 2 was supported.

Hypothesis 3: Analysis of variance was computed for the hypothesis analyzing communication apprehension and heterosocial apprehension. Results indicated a significant difference between high and low apprehensives

on heterosocial apprehension. ($F = 12.23$; $dF = 1/67$; $p < .001$) accounting for 15 percent of the variance. Specifically, low apprehensives reported lower degrees of heterosocial apprehension ($\bar{x} = 21.34$) than high apprehensives reported ($\bar{x} = 26.94$). Thus, hypothesis 3 was supported.

Hypothesis 4: Analysis of variance was computed for the hypothesis analyzing communication apprehension and heterosocial expectations. Results indicated no significant difference between high and low apprehensives on heterosocial expectations ($F = 2.47$; $dF = 1/67$; NS).

Hypothesis 5: Analysis of variance was computed for the hypothesis analyzing communication apprehension and physical attractiveness. Results indicated a significant difference between high and low apprehensives on physical attractiveness ($F = 7.54$; $dF = 1/67$; $p < .01$) accounting for 10 percent of the variance. Specifically, low apprehensives reported greater degrees of perceived self-physical attractiveness ($\bar{x} = 24.21$) than high apprehensives reported ($\bar{x} = 20.09$). Thus, hypothesis 5 was supported.

Hypothesis 6: Analysis of variance was computed for the hypothesis analyzing communication apprehension and

heterosocial importance. Results indicated no significant difference between high and low apprehensives on heterosocial importance ($F = 2.24$; $dF = 1/67$; NS).[5]

Hypothesis 7: Analysis of variance was computed for the hypothesis analyzing communciation apprehension and activity. Results indicated no significant difference between high and low apprehensives on activity ($F = .85$; $dF = 1/67$; NS).

Hypothesis 8: Analysis of variance was computed for the hypothesis analyzing communication apprehension and proximity. Results indicated no significant differences between high and low apprehensives on proximity ($F = 29.95$; $dF = 1/67$; NS).[5]

DISCUSSION

This investigation examined the relationship between levels of communication apprehension (high vs. low) on the eight relational practices dimensions (i.e., conditioned anxiety, heterosocial skills, heterosocial apprehension, heterosocial expectations, physical attractiveness, heterosocial importance, activity and proximity.) It was suggested that heterosocial communicative behavior and communication apprehension are related areas of communicative competency and, thus, were worth investigating. This researcher feels that heterosocial competence is a crucial area to be studied since many college students are concerned about minimal dating and often times seek psychological help. Thus, establishing the relationships among those variables which are related to anxiety need to be explored if individuals are to benefit from our research findings in terms of heterosocial/communicative assessment and treatment program effectiveness.

Interpretation of the Results

Hypothesis 1 indicated a significant difference between high and low apprehensives on heterosocial skills. The individual with lower degrees of CA perceives himself/herself as having the communication skills necessary to date (i.e., initiating a date, asking relevant and interesting questions, knowing when to talk and when to listen, and having the ability to initiate new topics into the conversation). Since the high apprehensive perceives himself as lacking the necessary skills to date, he/she generally avoids going on dates.

Hypothesis 2 suggested a signficant difference between high and low CA's on conditional anxiety. Individuals with low apprehension reported that previous dating encounters were generally pleasant and rewarding. In other words, they feel safe about future dating and would trust a future dating partner. On the other hand, high apprehensives generally feel that dating is tricky and deceptive and would be cautious about future dating. Thus, high CA's would tend to avoid future dating.

Hypothesis 3 was supported. High apprehensives are also situationally apprehensive in the dating context. Thus, the individual becomes anxious, nervous, and tense and generally does not feel good about himself/herself when dating. In this instance, high apprehensives would not, for the most part, receive a great deal of positive feedback from their dating partner. Thus, individuals would probably choose not to go on dates

because of their negative implications. Therefore, avoidance of dating becomes a positive reinforcer.

Hypothesis 4 indicated no significant difference between low and high apprehensives on heterosocial expectations. In addition, the simple correlation between CA and expectations was non-significant ($r = -.06$) (see Table 2). Thus, it appears that heterosocial expectations as operationalized is not contributing to our understanding of heterosocial behavior and communication apprehension.

Moreover, one should note the correlations between expectations and the other relational practices variables (see Table 2). Heterosocial expectations did not significantly correlate with any relational practices dimension. Thus, the heterosocial expectations domain needs further conceptual and operational refinement.

Hypothesis 5 indicated that low and high apprehensives significantly differ on physical attractiveness. Specifically, low CA's perceive themselves as being physically more attractive than high CA's. Since physical attractiveness plays an important role in dating (Berscheid and Walster, 1973), high apprehensive individuals probably avoid dating encounters because of their low self-physical image. In addition, others probably are not going to ask them on a date, if, in fact, they are unattractive. This notion would, then, reinforce for the individuals that they are physically unattractive.

Hypothesis 6 indicated no significant difference between high and low apprehensives on heterosocial importance. In addition, the simple correlation between CA and importance was non-significant (r = .11) (see Table 2). Thus, the significance of dating does not differentiate between levels of CA.

Hypothesis 7 suggested that high and low apprehensives do not significantly differ on activity. In addition, the simple correlation between CA and activity was non-significant (r = .06) (see Table 2). Thus, high and low apprehensives do not engage in more or less activities than one another.

Finally, hypothesis 8 demonstrated no significant difference between high and low CA on proximity. However, the relationship between CA and proximity was significant (r = -.15) (see Table 2). Although high and low CA's do not differentiate on proximity, one can conclude that the variables as related and may have an impact on individuals dating patterns.

Known Group Validity

Another outcome of this investigation was the construct validation of the Relational Practices Instrument (RPI). The method used was the known-groups method (Kerlinger, 1973). "In this method groups of people with 'known' characteristics are administered an instrument and the direction of differences

is predicted" (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 467). In this study, the known-groups were high and low apprehensive individuals. Differences were, then, predicted from the eight dimensions of the Relational Practices Instrument. Four of the eight relational practices dimensions differentiated between high and low apprehensive individuals (i.e., conditioned anxiety, heterosocial apprehension, physical attractiveness, and heterosocial skills). Thus, some support for construct validity of the Relational Practices Instrument was demonstrated.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Since the PRCA and RPI are assessment-type instruments and are used by communciation teachers and researchers, it becomes necessary to deal directly with the outcomes of these measures. In other words, what can we do as communication teachers and researchers to help those individuals reporting specific deficits.

Specifically, an important goal of communication teachers is that of providing the student with opportunities to develop communicative competencies in a wide variety of communicative contexts (Lieb-Brilhart, 1975). In the area of interpersonal communication, many approaches have been used to develop students' dyadic skills including the development of various undergraduate interpersonal communciation courses. In addition, researchers and teachers have developed outside-the-classroom workshops aimed at strengthening students' deficits in specific communicative areas. Upon assessing students' communicative deficits, individuals are then asked if they are interested in participating in a program designed to help people increase skill performance. Thus, future research in the areas of communiation apprehension and hetero-social behavior assessment need to examine the area of treatment (i.e., anxiety reduction, skills acquisition, and cognitive modification).

In addition, future research in the area of CA and heterosocial behavior should examine and conceptualize various competing causal models. For example, does a lack of heterosocial skills lead to heterosocial apprehension which causes the individual to be an infrequent and dissatisfied dater, thus increasing one's overall communication apprehension. Additionally, heterosocial apprehension could cause conditional anxiety which could create higher levels of apprehension, thus, causing the individual to have minimal heterosocial skills.

Finally, the relationships between communication apprehension and heterosocial quantity and heterosocial satisfaction need to be studied. Since the relationships between various explanatory components of heterosocial behavior and communication apprehension have been assessed, the implications of these behaviors need examination. For instance, is there a difference between high and low apprehension on heterosocial satisfaction or heterosocial quantity. Thus, future research needs to examine this question and others so that a better understanding of heterosocial behavior and its implications are developed.

NOTES

1. All subjects completed the packet at home, except four sections of undergraduate communication classes. In this case, the researcher asked students to voluntarily and anonymously complete the scales during the next 30-40 minutes of class time.

2. Item-scale correlation results can be obtained from the author.

3. Copies of the RPI and PRCA-24 can be obtained by writing the author.

4. Factor loadings for the RPI and PRCA-24 can be obtained by writing the author.

5. For these hypotheses, power was computed with the methods recommended by Winer (1962). Power results indicated that expectations (.11), proximity (.21) and importance (.06) have limited amounts of power necessary to detect a difference, if indeed one existed.

REFERENCES

Berscheid, E., and Walster, E. Physical attractiveness. In L. Berkowitz (ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 7). New York: Academic Press, 1973, 158-215.

Borkovec, T. D., Fleischmann, D. J., and Caputo, J. A. The measurement of social anxiety in an analogue social situation. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 41, 1957-161.

Byrne, D. The influence of propinquity and opportunities for interaction on classroom relationships. Human Relations, 1961, 14, 63-70. (a)

Cattell, R. Factor Analysis. New York: Harper & Row, 1952.

Clarke, A. C. An examination of the operation of residual propinquity as a factor in mate selection. American Sociological Review, 1952, 27, 17-22.

Curran, J. P. Skills training as an approach to the treatment of heterosexual-social anxiety: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 1977, 84, 140-157.

Daly, J. A. The effects of differential durations of time on interpersonal judgements based on vocal activity. Unpublished masters thesis, West Virginia University, 1974.

Fenton, R. J., and Hopf, T. S. Some effects of communication inhibition on small groups: Participation, member satisfaction, perceived effectiveness, credibility, and leadership. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, San Francisco, 1976.

Festinger, L., Schachter, S., and Back, K. Social pressures in informal groups: A study of human factors in housing. New York: Harper, 1950.

Galassi, J. P., and Galassi, M. D. Modification of heterosocial skills dificits. In A. S. Bellack and M. Hersen (Eds.), Research and practice in social skills training. New York: Plenum Press, 1979.

Hamilton, P. R. The effect of risk proneness on small group interaction, communication apprehension, and self-disclosure. Unpublished masters thesis, Illinois State University, 1972.

Heston, J. K. Unwillingness to communicate and conflice as predictors of information processing behaviors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, 1974.

Hurt, T. Preiss, R., and Davis, B. The effects of communication apprehension of middle-school children on sociometric choice, affective and cognitive learning. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, Portland, Oregon, 1976.

Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research (2nd edition) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Klaus, D., Hersen, M., and Bellack, A. S. Survey of dating habits of male and female college students: A necessary precursor to measurement and modification. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1977, 2, 369-375.

Knapp, M. L. Social Intercourse: From Greeting to Goodbye. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978.

Lieb-Brilhart, B., Guidelines for speech communication and theatre programs in teacher education. The Speech Teacher, 1975, 24, 343-364.

Maissonneuve, J., Palmade, G., and Fourment, C. Selective choice and propinquity. Sociometry, 1952, 15, 135-140.

Martinson, W., and Zerface, J. Comparison of an individual counseling and a social program with non-daters. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 36-40.

McCroskey, J. C. Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. Human Communication Research, 1977, 1, 78-96.

McCroskey, J. C. Oral communication apprehension: Reconceptualization and a new look at measurement. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Central States Speech Association Convention, Chicago, 1981.

McCroskey, J. C., Daly, J. A., Richmond, V. P., and Cox, B. G. The effects of communication apprehension on interpersonal attraction. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, Houston, Texas, 1975.

McCroskey, J. C., Daly, J. A., Richmond, V. P., and Falcione, R. L. Studies of the relationship between communication apprehension and self-esteem. Human Communication Research, 1977, 3, 269-277.

McCroskey, J. C., Daly, J. A., and Sorensen, G. A. Personality correlates of communication apprehension. Human Communication Research, 1976, 2, 376-380.

McCroskey, J. C., Hamilton, P. R., and Weiner, A. N. The effect of interaction behavior on source credibility, homophily, and interpersonal attraction. Human Communication Research, 1974, 1, 42-52.

McCroskey, J. S., and Leppard, T. The effects of communication apprehension on nonverbal behavior. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association convention, New York, 1975.

McCroskey, J. C., and McVetta, R. W. The relationship between communication apprehension and classroom seating preferences. Unpublished monograph, West Virginia University, 1977.

McCroskey, J. C., and Richmond, V. P. The effects of communication apprehension on the perception of peers. Western Speech Communication, 1976, 40, 14-21.

McCroskey, J. C., and Sheahan, M. E. Seating position and participation: An alternative theoretical explanation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association convention, Portland, 1976.

McCroskey, J. C., and Sheahan, M. E. Communication apprehension, social preference, and social behavior. Communication Quarterly, 1978, 2, 41-45.

McCroskey, J. C., and Young, T. J. The use and abuse of factor analysis in communication research. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association convention, Chicago, 1975.

Nahemow, L., and Lawton, M. P. Similarity and propinquity in friendship formation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 204-213.

Nunnally, J. C. Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Parks, M. R., Dindia, K., Adams, J., Berlin, E., and Larson, K. Communication apprehension and student dating patterns: A replication and extension. Communication Quarterly, 1980, 2, 3-9.

Perri, M. G. Behavior modification of heterosocial difficulties: A review of conceptual, treatment and assessment considerations. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1977, 7, 75. (Ms. No. 15 30).

Prisbell, M. Heterosocial communicative behavior: The development of an assessment instrument. Unpublished paper, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1981.

Scott, M. D., and Powers, W. G. Interpersonal communication: A question of needs. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1978.

Scott, M. D., Yates, M. P., and Wheeless, L. R. An exploratory investigation of the effects of communication apprehension in alternative systems of instruction. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, Chicago, 1975.

Snavely, W. B., Merker, G. E., Becker, L. L., and Book, V. A. Predictors of interpersonal communication apprehension in the acquaintance context. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association convention, San Francisco, 1976.

Snavely, W. B., and Sullivan, D. L. Components of self-esteem as predictors of oral communication apprehension. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association convention, San Francisco, 1976.

Weiner, A. N. Machiavellianism as a predictor of group interaction and cohesion. M. A. thesis, West Virginia University, 1973.

Wells, J., and Lashbook, W. B. A study of the effects of systematic desensitization on the communicative anxiety of individuals in small groups. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, 1970.

Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Wissmiller, A. P., and Merker, G. E. Communication apprehension, social distance, and interpersonal judgements in small groups. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, San Francisco, 1976.

Wood, D. A. Test construction. Columbus: Merrill, 1960.

Wylie, R. C. The Self-concept. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

TABLE 1

Scale Summary Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Internal Reliability
Conditioned Anxiety	200	35.48	8.60	.79
Heterosocial Importance	200	35.38	9.48	.93
Activity	200	22.84	6.35	.84
Proximity	200	32.35	8.66	.86
Physical Attractiveness	200	21.73	5.82	.90
Heterosocial Apprehension	200	24.01	6.16	.93
Heterosocial Expectations	200	11.47	4.23	.80
Heterosocial Skills	200	46.27	7.72	.82
Communication Apprehension	200	63.77	19.74	.95

TABLE 2

Correlation Coefficient Matrix

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
(1)	Conditioned Anxiety	1.00	.18	.29	.05*	.07*	.35	-.11*	.26	-.18
(2)	Importance		1.00	.44	.09*	.04*	.26	-.13*	.18	.11*
(3)	Activity			1.00	.10*	.002*	.20	-.03*	.07*	.06*
(4)	Proximity				1.00	.26	.27	.07*	.31	-.15
(5)	Physical Attractiveness					1.00	.40	.08*	.42	-.17
(6)	Heterosocial Apprehension						1.00	.07*	.61	.31
(7)	Expectations							1.00	.11*	-.06*
(8)	Skills								1.00	-.39
(9)	Communication Apprehension									1.00

N = 200

* Not Significant at .05 level